

Honorable Members of the Judiciary Committee,

This updated version of the "Risk Protection Orders" removes one of the protections of ensuring that the allegation is based in fact. I am concerned that a disgruntled neighbor or former love interest could level this kind of action without repercussion. It would be different if the accuser had to post a \$10,000 bond for face prosecution for false claims with mandatory jail time.... but there is none of that. There is NO repercussions for any false claims. NONE. So, if this passes, every neighbor v neighbor ugliness would be who filed first. Lawsuits v lawsuits. Quite frankly our towns cannot afford this type of drama.

Thinking back to how it is now...it would remove the requirement that 2 officers must complete an investigation first. In Mullane v. Central Hanover Bank, the 14th Amendment was used to ensure that Due Process requires at a minimum (1) notice; (2) an opportunity to be heard; and (3) an impartial tribunal before property is taken.

If the risk is so great, why is this bill removing 24/7 contact with a Judge after an investigation is completed by police? **(Think spouse v spouse!!)** Is this not creating a higher risk for those who it is trying to protect? Taking away the police involvement at the time is critical for the defense of all involved. Allowing anyone to go to a State Attorney during only court hours dampens the issue that is "Impending life-threatening just cause. Furthermore, if the person is such a risk, a 48-hour psychological evaluation should be ordered for the immediacy of mental health and the first step to adjudicate as mentally ill to remove the firearms.

I also fear that this will be used as a way to disarm someone so they can become easy prey (in the case divorce/domestic violence) Again: **Think spouse v spouse!!** I know when I was looking to file for divorce more than a few lawyers suggested a restraining order even though it was not needed. Prove this will be different!!

I strongly oppose the issue that you have to petition the court to get your firearms back. This creates an **undue financial** burden being imposed for seizing firearms. Also, if one owns a collectible or unique gun there are negative statistics about getting them back. (Yes, I am saying LE will repossess things of perceived value.) The proposed law does not have any mechanism to return the firearms that were seized under a **false allegation**. No allowance for those firearms which were grandfathered under the previous law to be returned to the original owner, thus depriving the value of property the person purchased.

Nothing requiring Law Enforcement to **POST A BOND** for the real value of the firearms to ensure the disenfranchised owner is made whole. Heck, Law Enforcement with nefarious intentions could initiate this course of action - JUST so that they could take possession of high value / antique firearms.

As a single parent, firearms instructor and women's advocate I feel this bill targets me, specifically and personally.

Bottom Line – THIS IS WRONG!!!

Thank you,
Elizabeth Drysdale
(she, her, hers)
Cheshire, Connecticut